

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

105th Congress  
1st Session

Vote No. 197

July 23, 1997, 5:21 pm  
Page S-7924 Temp. Record

## AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS/Ethanol Tax for Anti-Tobacco Fund

**SUBJECT:** Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1998 . . . S. 1033.  
Harkin motion to table the Helms modified perfecting amendment No. 969 to the Harkin amendment No. 968.

### ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 76-24

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported, S. 1033, the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1998, will provide \$50.685 billion in new budget authority, 73 percent of which will be for mandatory spending programs and 75 percent of which will be for food welfare programs (both mandatory and discretionary).

The Harkin amendment would impose a new fee on tobacco and would give the \$34 million that would be raised to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). The fee would apply to the 1997 crop of tobacco (other than flue-cured tobacco) and to the 1998 crop of flue-cured tobacco. The fee would be equal to 2.1 percent of the support price, and would be collected from the purchaser or importer. The amendment would also encourage States to coordinate their enforcement efforts under the FDA's youth tobacco-use prevention initiative with their enforcement efforts to stop underage drinking of alcohol.

**The Helms modified amendment** would strike all after the first word of the Harkin amendment and would substitute language to increase the tax on ethanol for fiscal year 1998 by 3 cents per gallon and to use the proceeds to create an anti-smoking trust fund. Appropriations bills could then provide for withdrawals from that trust fund to pay for anti-smoking programs of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). Additionally, the amendment would encourage States to coordinate their programs to stop underage use of tobacco and alcohol.

During debate, Senator Harkin moved to table the Helms amendment. A motion to table is not debatable; however, some debate preceded the making of the motion. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

NOTE: The Senate subsequently tabled the Harkin amendment; see vote No. 198.

(See other side)

YEAS (76)				NAYS (24)		NOT VOTING (0)	
Republican (33 or 60%)		Democrats (43 or 96%)		Republicans (22 or 40%)	Democrats (2 or 4%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Hagel	Akaka	Kennedy	Bennett	Ford		
Allard	Hatch	Baucus	Kerrey	Campbell	Hollings		
Ashcroft	Jeffords	Biden	Kerry	Cochran			
Bond	Kempthorne	Bingaman	Kohl	D'Amato			
Brownback	Lugar	Boxer	Landrieu	Faircloth			
Burns	Mack	Breaux	Lautenberg	Frist			
Chafee	McCain	Bryan	Leahy	Gramm			
Coats	Roberts	Bumpers	Levin	Gregg			
Collins	Santorum	Byrd	Lieberman	Helms			
Coverdell	Sessions	Cleland	Mikulski	Hutchinson			
Craig	Shelby	Conrad	Moseley-Braun	Hutchison			
DeWine	Smith, Bob	Daschle	Moynihan	Inhofe			
Domenici	Smith, Gordon	Dodd	Murray	Kyl			
Enzi	Snowe	Dorgan	Reed	Lott			
Gorton	Specter	Durbin	Reid	McConnell			
Grams	Thomas	Feingold	Robb	Murkowski			
Grassley		Feinstein	Rockefeller	Nickles			
		Glenn	Sarbanes	Roth			
		Graham	Torricelli	Stevens			
		Harkin	Wellstone	Thompson			
		Inouye	Wyden	Thurmond			
		Johnson		Warner			

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

#### SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

**Those favoring** the motion to table contended:

The Helms amendment would not really accomplish anything. It would not require the money to be spent; it would just create a trust fund and would allow it to be spent. We urge our colleagues to reject this amendment in favor of the underlying amendment.

**Those opposing** the motion to table contended:

The Helms amendment would create an anti-smoking trust fund. Our colleagues complain that it would not require Congress to approve any appropriations from that fund for anti-smoking programs. The same criticism that our colleagues make of the Helms amendment applies to the Harkin amendment; the Harkin amendment would just give more money to the FDA on the assumption that the FDA would spend it on its youth anti-smoking initiative. In our opinion, the criticism is invalid in both cases. In the latter case, the FDA can be trusted to follow Congress' intent; in the former case, Congress can be trusted to follow its own intent. For both amendments, the end result would be increased funding for anti-smoking programs. For both amendments, States would be encouraged to coordinate their efforts to stop underage smoking and drinking. The main difference is the funding source. The Harkin amendment would impose a tax that would hurt small family farms; the Helms amendment would impose a tax on alcohol. The latter funding source is less objectionable, so we oppose the motion to table.